UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,363	05/29/2001	Chidambaram Krishnan	010094	5659

23696 7590 01/10/2008

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER	
MOORTHY, ARAVIND K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com
kascanla@qualcomm.com
nanm@qualcomm.com

MN

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/867,363
Filing Date: May 29, 2001
Appellant(s): KRISHNAN ET AL.

Eric Ho
Reg. No. 39,711
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 19 October 2007 appealing from the Final Office action mailed 30 May 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,487,425	Thakker et al	11-2002
6,741,848	Timonen et al	05-2004
6,595,414	Eber et al	07-2003

EP0607767 Barvesten, Mats Olof 07-1994

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 16-21, 23-25, 32-37, 39-41, 48, 74-78, 80-82, 89-94, 96-98 and 105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Thakker et al U.S. Patent No. 6,487,425 B1.

As to claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90, Thakker et al discloses a method for controlling power to a subscriber identity module (S1M) in a wireless communication device (WCD), the method comprising:

supplying power to the SIM [column 5, lines 28-37] when a request is pending for service by the SIM [column 6, lines 28-49];

supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM [column 6, lines 28-49]; and

terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM [column 7, lines 42-64].

As to claims 2, 18, 34, 75 and 91, Thakker et al discloses re-initiating supply of power to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM [column 6, lines 28-49].

As to claims 3, 19, 35, 76 and 92, Thakker et al discloses determining whether a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM based on inspection of a request queue associated with the SIM [column 8, lines 47-62].

As to claims 4, 20, 37, 77 and 93, Thakker et al discloses re-initiating supply of power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM [column 6, lines 28-49].

As to claims 5, 21, 37, 78 and 94, Thakker et al discloses determining whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on polling of any of a plurality of software modules running on the WCD [column 8, lines 47-62].

As to claims 7, 23, 39, 80 and 96, Thakker et al discloses supplying power to the SIM includes maintaining power to the SIM [column 8, lines 47-62].

As to claims 8, 24, 40, 81 and 97, Thakker et al discloses that the SIM includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, and terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power to the interface circuit [column 7, lines 42-64].

As to claims 9, 25, 41, 82 and 98, Thakker et al discloses that the SIM includes a power supply line coupled to the WCD, and terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power to the power supply line [column 7, lines 42-64].

As to claims 16, 32, 48, 89 and 105, Thakker et al discloses that the WCD is one of a cellular radiotelephone, a satellite radiotelephone, a PCMCIA card, and a PDA that communicates according to one of the CDMA standard, the GSM standard, and the WCDMA standard [column 4, lines 42-54].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 22, 38, 79 and 95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker et al U.S. Patent No. 6,487,425 B1 as applied to claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 above, and further in view of Timonen et al U.S. Patent No. 6,741,848 B2.

As to claims 6, 22, 38, 79 and 95, Thakker et al does not teach asserting respective bits in a data structure when corresponding software modules running on the WCD request supply of power to the SIM. Thakker et al does not teach determining whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on analysis the data structure. Thakker et al does not teach when any of the bits in the data structure is asserted, supplying power to the SIM.

Timonen et al teaches asserting respective bits in a data structure [column 3, lines 3-20]. Timonen et al teaches analyzing the data structure [column 3, lines 21-32].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thakker et al so that respective bits in a data structure would have been asserted when corresponding software modules running on the WCD requested supply of power to the SIM. It would have been determined whether a software module running on the WCD requested supply of power to the SIM by analyzing the data structure. When any of the bits in the data structure were asserted, power would have been supplied to the SIM.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thakker et al by the teaching of Timonen et al because it continues to increase computer system functionality as user needs evolve, modifications to existing components can be prohibitively costly and can limit backward-compatibility. To date, no one has designed a computer system to transmit more than eight bits of information on an eight-bit serial bus [column 3, lines 49-54].

Claims 10, 26, 42, 83 and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker et al U.S. Patent No. 6,487,425 B1 as applied to claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 above, and further in view of Eber et al U.S. Patent No. 6,595,414 B1.

As to claims 10, 26, 42, 83 and 99, Thakker et al teaches that the SIM includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, as discussed above.

Thakker et al does not teach that the interface circuit includes a clock input to the SIM. Thakker et al does not teach that terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power after terminating a clock signal to the clock input.

Eber et al teaches that the interface circuit that includes a clock input [column 8, lines 14-36]. Eber et al teaches terminating power includes terminating power after terminating a clock signal to the clock input [column 8, lines 14-36].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thakker et al so that the interface circuit would have included a clock input to the removable user identity module. Power would have been terminated to the SIM and included terminating power after terminating a clock signal to the clock input.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thakker et al by the teaching of Eber et al because it limits the range over which communication is possible between the known data carrier and a write/read station adapted to cooperate with this data carrier [column 2, lines 1-24].

Claims 11-13, 27-29, 43-45, 84-86 and 100-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker et al U.S. Patent No. 6,487,425 B1 as applied to claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 above, and further in view of Barvesten, Mats Olof EP 0607767 A1 (hereinafter Barvesten).

As to claims 11-13, 27-29, 43-45, 84-86 and 100-102, Thakker et al teaches that the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM) [column 5, lines 28-37] and a GSM SIM [column 5, lines 28-37].

Thakker et al does not teach storing a user access code associated with the SIM in a memory associated with the WCD in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD. Thakker et al does not teach retrieving the user access code from the memory when power is supplied to the SIM following the termination of power to the SIM. Thakker et al does not teach using the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of secure features of the SIM. Thakker et al does not teach storing the user access code includes storing the user access code upon the termination of power to the SIM.

Barvesten teaches storing a user access code associated with the SIM in a memory associated with the WCD in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD [pages 3 and 4]. Barvesten teaches using the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of secure features of the SIM [pages 3 and 4].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thakker et al so that a user access code (PIN) would have been associated with the SIM in a memory associated with the WCD in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD. The user access code would have been retrieved from the memory when power was supplied to the SIM following the termination of power to the SIM. The retrieved user access code would have been used in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of secure features of the SIM. The storing of the user access code would have included storing the user access code upon the termination of power to the SIM.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thakker et al by the teaching of Barvesten because it protects the phone and features of the SIM as well [page 2].

Claims 14, 15, 30, 31, 46, 47, 87, 88, 103 and 104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker et al U.S. Patent No. 6,487,425 B1 and Barvesten EP 0607767 A1 as applied to claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 above, and further in view of Timonen et al U.S. Patent No. 6,741,848 B2.

As to claims 14, 15, 30, 31, 46, 47, 87, 88, 103 and 104, the Thakker-Barvesten combination teaches that the user access code is a personal identification number (PIN), as discussed above. Thakker et al teaches that the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM) and a GSM SIM, as discussed above.

The Thakker-Barvesten combination does not teach that the SIM is a universal subscriber identification module (USIM).

Timonen et al teaches a SIM that is a universal subscriber identification module (USIM) [column 16, lines 14-23].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Thakker-Barvesten combination so that the SIM would have been replaced by a universal identification module (USIM).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Thakker-Barvesten combination by the teaching of Timonen et al because it can be used for user identification and interoperability between mobile communications systems and the GSM system [column 16, lines 14-23].

Claims 49, 52, 53, 55-57, 60, 61, 63-65, 68, 69 and 71-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker et al U.S. Patent No. 6,487,425 B1 in view of Barvesten, Mats Olof EP 0607767 A1 (hereinafter Barvesten).

As to claims 49, 52, 53, 57, 60, 61, 65, 68, 69 and 73, Thakker et al teaches that the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM) [column 5, lines 28-37] and a GSM SIM [column 5, lines 28-37].

Thakker et al does not teach storing a user access code associated with the SIM in a memory associated with the WCD in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD. Thakker et al does not teach retrieving the user access code from the memory when power is supplied to the SIM following the termination of power to the SIM. Thakker et al does not teach using the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of secure features of the SIM. Thakker et al does not teach storing the user access code includes storing the user access code upon the termination of power to the SIM.

Barvesten teaches storing a user access code associated with the SIM in a memory associated with the WCD in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD [pages 3 and 4]. Barvesten teaches using the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of secure features of the SIM [pages 3 and 4].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thakker et al so that a user access code (PIN) would have been associated with the SIM in a memory associated with the WCD in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD. The user access code would

have been retrieved from the memory when power was supplied to the SIM following the termination of power to the SIM. The retrieved user access code would have been used in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of secure features of the SIM. The storing of the user access code would have included storing the user access code upon the termination of power to the SIM.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thakker et al by the teaching of Barvesten because it protects the phone and features of the SIM as well [page 2].

As to claims 55, 63 and 71, Thakker et al teaches that the SIM is a GSM SIM [column 5, lines 28-37].

As to claims 56, 64 and 72, Thakker et al discloses that the WCD is one of a cellular radiotelephone, a satellite radiotelephone, a PCMCIA card, and a PDA that communicates according to one of the CDMA standard, the GSM standard, and the WCDMA standard [column 4, lines 42-54].

Claims 54, 62 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker et al U.S. Patent No. 6,487,425 B1 and Barvesten EP 0607767 A1 as applied to claims 49, 57 and 65 above, and further in view of Timonen et al U.S. Patent No. 6,741,848 B2.

As to claims 54, 62 and 70, the Thakker-Barvesten combination teaches that the user access code is a personal identification number (PIN), as discussed above. Thakker et al teaches that the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM) and a GSM SIM, as discussed above.

The Thakker-Barvesten combination does not teach that the SIM is a universal subscriber identification module (USIM).

Timonen et al teaches a SIM that is a universal subscriber identification module (USIM) [column 16, lines 14-23].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Thakker-Barvesten combination so that the SIM would have been replaced by a universal identification module (USIM).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Thakker-Barvesten combination by the teaching of Timonen et al because it can be used for user identification and interoperability between mobile communications systems and the GSM system [column 16, lines 14-23].

(10) Response to Argument

On page 10, the Appellants argue that Thakker does not disclose any techniques for managing power to a SIM in a WCD when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Thakker discloses that MS 12 (mobile station) includes a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM) [column 5, lines 29-31]. Thakker discloses that MS receives messages from the Mobile Switching Center (MSC) to instruct the MS to switch from the limited operations low power mode to a normal operating mode [column 6, lines 41-49]. The examiner asserts that it is well known in the art that the power supplied to the SIM comes from the MS. Therefore, if the MS is receiving messages from the MSC to switch from the limited

operations low power mode to a normal operating mode then the same modes of power operation would affect the SIM as well.

On page 11, the Appellants argue that Thakker does not disclose whether or not power is supplied to a SIM in the different modes, much less teach the specific features of Appellants' claims that require the supply of power or the termination of power to a SIM based on whether a request is pending for service by the SIM or the device requests maintenance of power to the SIM.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, the SIM is affected by any changes of power mode made to the MS. Thakker discloses that MS receives messages from the Mobile Switching Center (MSC) to instruct the MS to switch from the limited operations low power mode to a normal operating mode [column 6, lines 41-49]. Thakker discloses that while in POP (Power on Page) mode, the MS has terminated power (i.e. minimal) power where only critical operations are maintained and the display is blank and no outgoing calls are made unless POP mode is disabled [column 7, lines 46-50]. The proprietary message or A-interface message is transmitted during the POP signal sequence 112. If the MS 50 receives the POP message from the GSM network 40, then the MS 50 is capable of switching to a normal operating mode wherein normal levels of power are utilized by the MS 50. In this way, a call to the MSISDN number associated with the limited operations low power mode of the MS 50 causes the MS 50 to switch to normal operating mode [column 8, lines 17-25].

On pages 12 and 13, the Appellant argues that the user placing a mobile station in limited operation mode (per Thakker) is not suggestive of a technique that requires supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for service by the SIM, supplying power to the SIM when a

software module running on the WCD request maintenance of power to the SIM, and terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD request maintenance of power to the SIM.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, a call to the MSISDN number associated with the limited operations low power mode of the MS 50 causes the MS 50 to switch to normal operating mode. Thakker discloses that while in POP (Power on Page) mode, the MS has terminated power (i.e. minimal) power where only critical operations are maintained and the display is blank and no outgoing calls are made unless POP mode is disabled [column 7, lines 46-50].

On page 14, the Appellant argues that the pending claims require managing power to a SIM in a WCD when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD. The Appellant argues that these features also distinguish Thakker insofar as Thakker merely teaches low power modes for the WCD, and does not have any discussion of power management to a SIM within a WCD. The Appellant argues that the power management techniques discussed in Thakker lack any teaching with respect to the supply or termination of power specifically to a SIM within a WCD, much less the supply or termination of power to a SIM based on the specific contingencies of Appellants' claims.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, a call to the MSISDN number associated with the limited operations low power mode of the MS 50 causes the MS 50 to switch to normal operating mode. The examiner asserts that it is well known in the art that the power supplied to the SIM comes from the MS. Therefore, if the WCD has power management (i.e.

switching between low power mode and normal power mode) then the SIM would also go through these same power mode changes.

On page 16, the Appellant argues that Thakker does not disclose terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM. The Appellant argues that Thakker fails to suggest supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for service by the SIM, supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM, and terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD request maintenance of power to the SIM as required by independent claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Thakker discloses that while in POP (Power on Page) mode, the MS has terminated power (i.e. minimal) power where only critical operations are maintained and the display is blank and no outgoing calls are made unless POP mode is disabled [column 7, lines 46-50]. As discussed above, a call to the MSISDN number associated with the limited operations low power mode of the MS 50 causes the MS 50 to switch to normal operating mode.

On page 17, the Appellant argues that a mere mention of a "limited operation mode" per Thakker is not suggestive of a technique for managing power to a SIM when power is supplied to the WCD, much less a technique that requires the supply or termination of power to the SIM based on whether a request is pending for service by the SIM or a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM, as required by Appellants' claims.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner does not rely on "limited operation mode" for suggesting managing power when power is supplied to the WCD. As discussed

above, Thakker discloses low power mode and normal power mode to teach the limitation of managing power. As discussed above, a call to the MSISDN number associated with the limited operations low power mode of the MS 50 causes the MS 50 to switch to normal operating mode.

On page 18, the Appellant argues that while Thakker may disclose a message to instruct a mobile station to switch from a limited operations low power mode to a normal mode, nothing describes whether or not a SIM within a WCD receives power in the limited operations low power mode.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, it is well known in the art that the power supplied to the SIM comes from the MS. Therefore, if the MS is receiving messages from the MSC to switch from the limited operations low power mode to a normal operating mode then the same modes of power operation would affect the SIM as well.

On page 19, the Appellant argues that Thakker does not discloses any inspection of a request queue, much less determining whether a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM based on inspection of a request queue associated with the SIM, as required by claims 3, 19, 35, 76 and 92. Regarding claims 4, 20, 37, 77 and 93, the Appellant argues that Thakker fails to suggest re-initiating supply of power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD request supply of power to the SIM.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Thakker discloses that the MS 50 is responsible to inform the network 40 of its location as illustrated by the location update request signal sequence 96. Thus, the MS 50 powers up periodically in order to ascertain its location and update the network 40. This positioning is performed by allowing the MS 50 to send a LOCATION UPDATE REQUEST message to the GSM network 40. The GSM network 40, in turn, sends a

LOCATION UPDATING ACCEPT message at signal sequence 98, to the MS 50. By continuously updating the location of the MS 50 in the GSM network 40, a subscriber may be reached, even while the MS 50 is in POP mode [column 7, lines 51-64]. Thakker discloses The MS 50 is capable of acknowledging a transition to normal operating power levels by transmitting a POWER ON SUCCESSFUL ACKNOWLEDGMENT message, as illustrated in signal sequence 114 to the network 40. At this point, since the MS 50 is operating under normal conditions, the network 40 is able to terminate the call to the second MSISDN number using well known call setup and confirmation functions, e.g. paging 116. The presence of a normal terminated call is illustrated by signal sequence 118 [column 8, lines 26-34].

On page 20, the Appellant argues, regarding claims 5, 21, 38, 78 and 94, Thakker fails to suggest determining whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on polling of any of the plurality of software modules running on the WCD. The Appellant argues, regarding claims 8, 24, 40, 81 and 97, that Thakker fails to disclose or suggest a SIM that includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, wherein terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power to the interface circuit.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Referring to FIG. 6, a diagram of the POP feature messaging sequence, according to one embodiment, is illustrated and denoted generally as 90. The POP messaging sequence 90 begins as soon as the subscriber places the MS 50 in the limited operations low power mode by, for example, depressing the POP ON button 66. The MS 50 will send the GSM network 40 and A-interface message 44 indicating that POP mode has been initiated as shown by signal sequence 92. The MSC 42 will then recognize that the MS 50 wants to enter POP mode and returns a POP mode acknowledgment message at signal sequence

94. Alternatively, the GSM network 40 could reject POP mode activation by the MS 50. For example, if the MSC 42 is in an error mode, it can send back a reject acknowledgment. The user will then know that it could not switch to the POP mode due to, for example, no roaming availability or the roaming operator does not want to allow this service for non-network subscribers. The examiner asserts that it is well known in the art that a SIM includes an interface circuit that would interface with a WCD. Therefore, if no power is being supplied to a WCD, then no power would be supplied to a SIM.

On page 21, the Appellant agues, regarding claims 9, 25, 41, 82 and 98, that Thakker fails to disclose or suggest a SIM that includes a power supply line coupled to the WCD, wherein terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power to the power supply line.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner asserts that it is obvious that a SIM would include a power supply line coupled to the WCD. A SIM would not function if it did not have a power supply line coupled to the WCD. Therefore, by terminating power to a power supply line, the power to the SIM would have been terminated as well.

On page 24, the Appellant argues, regarding claims 6, 22, 38, 79 and 95, that Timonen does not teach asserting respective bits in a data structure when corresponding software modules running on the WCD request supply of power to the SIM, determining, whether a software module running on the WCD request supply of power to the SIM based on analysis of the data structure, and when any of the bits in the data structure is asserted, supplying power to the SIM.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Timonen discloses that the mobile station MS transmits a request for connection origination (service request, arrow 32) on an assigned signaling channel. In a typical GSM call, the mobile station transmits either a TMSI or an IMSI

identifier to the visited network in the request for connection origination. The network typically requests for the IMSI separately, if the TMSI is not known. Since neither of the identifiers is available, the mobile station MS either sends a message with an empty field in the space reserved for the TMSI or IMSI or it reports that it does not have a user identity. This can preferably be reported in the same message and in the same form as the IMSI or TMSI, differing, however, from the values reserved for them. A data field, in which the bits [000] refer to the type of username that is used for a mobile station having no right to access.

On page 26, the Appellant argues, regarding claims 10, 26, 42, 83 and 99, that Eber does not teach an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, the interface circuit including a clock input to the SIM, and wherein terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power after terminating a clock signal to the clock input. The Appellant argues that Barvesten does not disclose or suggest any security authorization process that authorizes the use of secure features of the SIM, as required by claims 11-13, 27-29, 43-45, 84-86 and 100-102.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, it is obvious that a SIM would have included an interface circuit that interfaces with a WCD. The examiner asserts that a clock is shown in figure 1 of Eber. The clock provides signals to the SIM. The combination of Thakker and Eber would have taught terminating power to the SIM would have included terminating power after terminating a clock signal to the clock input. The examiner asserts that Barvesten discloses that a PIN is used to unlock the secure features of a SIM [pages 3 and 4].

On page 29, the Appellant argues, regarding claims 49, 52, 53, 55-57, 60, 61, 63-65, 68, 69 and 71-73, that Thakker does not teach power management of a SIM within a WCD and the

fact that power management of a SIM in a WCD is different than security management of a WCD.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, Barvesten discloses a PIN for unlocking the secure features of the SIM. As discussed above, Thakker discloses power management of a SIM within a WCD.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Aravind K Moorthy

GILBERTO BARRON JR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Conferees:

/Benjamin Lanier/
Benjamin Lanier
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2132

Gilberto Barron
SPE 2132